Microstructure under the Microscope: Tools to Survive and Thrive in The Age of (Too Much) Information

Ravi Kashyap

IHS Markit / City University of Hong Kong

March 28, 2017

Microstructure, Marketstructure, Microscope, Dimension Reduction, Distance Measure, Covariance, Distribution, Uncertainty

JEL Codes: D53 Financial Markets; G17 Financial Forecasting and Simulation; C43 Index Numbers and Aggregation

arXiv:1703.08812v1 [q-fin.TR] 26 Mar 2017

Edited Version: Kashyap, R. (2017). Microstructure under the Microscope: Tools to Survive and Thrive in The Age of (Too Much) Information. The Journal of Trading, 12(2), 5-27.

Contents

1 Abstract **2**

2 Objectively Subjective **3**

2.1 Merry-Go-Round of Comparisons, Decisions and Actions 3

2.2 Interplay of Information and Intelligence 4

2.3 Simply Too Complex 6

2.4 Nuggets of Knowledge from Buckets of Nonsense 7

2.5 The Miracle of Mathematics 8

3 Methodological Fundamentals **9**

3.1 Notation and Terminology for Key Results 9

3.2 Bhattacharyya Distance 9

3.3 Dimension Reduction 11

4 From Symbols to Numbers, Empirical Illustrations across Markets **12**

4.1 Speaking Volumes Of: Comparison of Trading Volumes 13

4.2 A Pricey Prescription: Comparison of Prices (Open, Close, High and Low) 15

4.2.1 Open Close 15

4.2.2 High Low 17
4.3 Taming the (Volatility) Skew: Comparison of Close Price / Volume Volatilities 19

5 Possibilities for Future Research **21**

6 Conclusions **22**

7 Sleeping Aids (Notes and References) **23**

8 Appendix A: Dimension Reduction, Distance Measures and Covariance **30**
8.1 Normal Log-Normal Mixture 30
8.2 Normal Normal Product 31
8.3 Truncated Normal Distribution 31
8.4 Truncated Multivariate Normal Distribution 32
8.5 Covariance and Distance 33

1 Abstract

Market Microstructure is the investigation of the process and protocols that govern the exchange of assets with the objective of reducing frictions that can impede the transfer. In financial markets, where there is an abundance of recorded information, this translates to the study of the dynamic relationships between observed variables, such as price, volume and spread, and hidden constituents, such as transaction costs and volatility, that hold sway over the efficient functioning of the system.

"My dear, here we must process as much data as we can, just to stay in business. And if you wish to make a profit you must process atleast twice as much data." - Red Queen to Alice in Hedge-Fund-Land.

Necessity is the mother of all invention / creation / innovation, but the often forgotten father is frustration. In this age of (Too Much) Information, it is imperative to uncover nuggets of knowledge (signal) from buckets of nonsense (noise).

To aid in this effort to extract meaning from chaos and to gain a better understanding of the relationships between financial variables, we summarize the application of the theoretical results from (Kashyap 2016b) to microstructure studies. The central concept rests on a novel methodology based on the marriage between the Bhattacharyya distance, a measure of similarity across distributions, and the Johnson Lindenstrauss Lemma, a technique for dimension reduction, providing us with a simple yet powerful tool that allows comparisons between data-sets representing any two distributions.

We provide an empirical illustration using prices, volumes and volatilities across seven countries and three different continents. The degree to which different markets or sub groups of securities have different measures

of their corresponding distributions tells us the extent to which they are different. This can aid investors looking for diversification or looking for more of the same thing.

In Indian mythology, it is believed that in each era, God takes on an avatar or reincarnation to fight the main source of evil in that epoch and to restore the balance between good and bad. In this age of too much information and complexity, perhaps the supreme being needs to be born as a data scientist, conceivably with an apt nickname, the Infoman. Until higher powers intervene and provide the ultimate solution to completely eliminate information overload, we have to make do with marginal methods, such as this composition, to reduce information.

As we wait for the perfect solution, it is worth meditating upon what superior beings would do when faced with a complex situation, such as the one we are in. It is said that the Universe is but the Brahma's (Creator's) dream. Research (Effort / Struggle) can help us understand this world; Sleep (Ease / Peace of Mind) can help us create our own world. A lesson from close by and down under: We need to "Do Some Yoga and Sleep Like A Koala".

2 Objectively Subjective

A hall mark of the social sciences is the lack of objectivity. Here we assert that objectivity is with respect to comparisons done by different participants and that a comparison is a precursor to a decision.

Conjecture 1. ***Despite the several advances in the social sciences, we have yet to discover an objective measuring stick for comparison, a so called, True Comparison Theory, which can be an aid for arriving at objective decisions.***

The search for such a theory could again be compared, to the medieval alchemists' obsession with turning everything into gold (Kashyap 2014a). For our present purposes, the lack of such an objective measure means that the difference in comparisons, as assessed by different participants, can effect different decisions under the same set of circumstances. Hence, despite all the uncertainty in the social sciences, the one thing we can be almost certain about is the subjectivity in all decision making.

2.1 Merry-Go-Round of Comparisons, Decisions and Actions

This lack of an objective measure for comparisons, makes people react at varying degrees and at varying speeds, as they make their subjective decisions. A decision gives rise to an action and subjectivity in the comparison means differing decisions and hence unpredictable actions. This inability to make consistent predictions in the social sciences explains the growing trend towards comprehending better and deciphering

the decision process and the subsequent actions, by collecting more information across the entire cycle of comparisons, decisions and actions. Another feature of the social sciences is that the actions of participants affects the state of the system, effecting a state transfer which perpetuates another merry-go-round of comparisons, decisions and actions from the participants involved. This means, more the participants, more the changes to the system, more the actions and more the information that is generated to be gathered.

Restricted to the particular sub-universe of economic and financial theory, this translates to the lack of an objective measuring stick of value, a so called, True Value Theory. This lack of an objective measure of value, (hereafter, value will be synonymously referred to as the price of a financial instrument), makes prices react at differing degrees and at varying velocities to the pull of different macro and micro factors.

(Lawson 1985) argues that the Keynesian view on uncertainty (that it is generally impossible, even in probabilistic terms, to evaluate the future outcomes of all possible current actions; Keynes 1937; 1971; 1973), far from being innocuous or destructive of economic analysis in general, can give rise to research programs incorporating, amongst other things, a view of rational behavior under uncertainty, which could be potentially fruitful. (McManus and Hastings 2005) clarify the wide range of uncertainties that affect complex engineering systems and present a framework to understand the risks (and opportunities) they create and the strategies system designers can use to mitigate or take advantage of them. These viewpoints hold many lessons for policy designers in the social sciences and could be instructive for researchers looking to create methods to compare complex systems, keeping in mind the caveats of dynamic social systems.

2.2 Interplay of Information and Intelligence

On the surface, it would seem that there is a repetitive nature to portfolio management, which we can term "The Circle of Investment" (Kashyap 2014b), making it highly amenable to automation. But we need to remind ourselves that the reiterations happen under the purview of a special kind of uncertainty that applies to the social sciences. (Kashyap 2014a) goes into greater depth on how the accuracy of predictions and the popularity of generalizations might be inversely related in the social sciences. In the practice of investment management and also to aid other business decisions, more data sources are being created, collected and used along with increasing automation and artificial intelligence.

If Alice and Red Queen of the Wonderland fame (Carroll 1865; 1871; End-note 2) were to visit Hedge-Fund-Land (or even Business-Land), the following modification of their popular conversation would aptly describe the situation today, “My dear, here we must process as much data as we can, just to stay in business. And if you wish to make a profit you must process atleast twice as much data.”

We could also apply this to HFT-Land and say: “My dear, here we must trade as fast as we can, just to stay in business. And if you wish to make a profit, you must trade atleast twice as fast as that.”, while

reminiscing that the jury is still out on whether HFT is Good, Bad or Just Ugly and Unimportant.

In Academic-Land, this would become: "My dear, here we must process as much data (and include as many strange symbols or obfuscating terms) as we can, just to create a working paper. And if you wish to make a publication you must process atleast twice as much data (and include atleast twice as many strange characters or obfuscating expressions)."

We currently lack a proper understanding of how, in some instances, our brains (or minds; and right now it seems we don't know the difference!) make the leap of learning from information to knowledge to wisdom (See Mill 1829; Mazur 2015 for more about learning and behavior). The problem of creating artificial intelligence can be a child's play, depending on which adult's brainpower acts as our gold standard. Perhaps, the real challenge is to replicate the curiosity and learning an infant displays. Intellect might be a byproduct of Inquisitiveness, demonstrating another instance of an unintended yet welcome consequence (Kashyap 2016e). This brings up the question of Art and Science in the practice of asset management (and everything else in life?); which are more related than we probably realize, "Art is Science that we don't know about; Science is Art restricted to a set of symbols governed by a growing number of rules" (Kashyap 2014a).

While the similarities between art and science, should give us hope; we need to face the realities of the situation. Right now, arguably, in most cases, we (including computers and intelligent machines?) can barely make the jump from the information to the knowledge stage; even with the use of cutting / (bleeding?) edge technology and tools. This exemplifies three things:

1. We are still in the information age. As another route to establishing this, consider this: Information is Hidden; Knowledge is Exchanged or Bartered; Wisdom is Dispersed. Surely we are still in the Information Age since a disproportionate amount of our actions are geared towards accumulating unique data-sets for the sole benefits of the accumulators.

2. Automating the movement to a higher level of learning, which is necessary for dealing with certain doses of uncertainty, is still far away.

3. Some of us missed the memo that the best of humanity are actually robots in disguise, living amongst us.

Hence, it is not Manager versus Machine (Portfolio Manager vs Computing Machine or MAN vs MAC, in short; End-notes 3, 4, 5). Not even MAN and MAC against the MPC (Microsoft Personal Computer; End-notes 6, 7, 8)? It is MAN, MAC and the MPC against increasing complexity! (Also in scope are other computing platforms from the past, present and the future: Williams 1997; Ifrah, Harding, Bellos and Wood 2000; Ceruzzi 2003; End-notes 9, 10, 11, 12). This increasing complexity and information explosion is perhaps

due to the increasing number of complex actions perpetrated by the actors that comprise the financial system. The human mind will be obsolete if machines can fully manage assets and we would have bigger problems on our hands than who is managing our money. We need, and will continue to need, massive computing power to mostly separate the signal from the noise.

2.3 Simply Too Complex

(Simon 1962) points out that any attempt to seek properties common to many sorts of complex systems (physical, biological or social), would lead to a theory of hierarchy since a large proportion of complex systems observed in nature exhibit hierarchic structure; that a complex system is composed of subsystems that, in turn, have their own subsystems, and so on. This might hold a clue to the miracle that our minds perform; abstracting away from the dots that make up a picture, to fully visualizing the image, that seems far removed from the pieces that give form and meaning to it. To helps us gain a better understanding of the relationships between financial variables, we construct a metric built from smaller parts, but gives optimal benefits when seen from a higher level. Contrary to what conventional big picture conversations suggest, as the spectator steps back and the distance from the picture increases, the image becomes smaller yet clearer.

As a first step, we recognize that one possible categorization (Kashyap 2016c) of different fields can be done by the set of questions a particular field attempts to answer. The answers to the questions posed by any domain can come from anywhere or from phenomenon studied under a combination of many other disciplines. Hence, the answers to the questions posed under the realm of economics and finance can come from seemingly diverse subjects, such as, physics, biology, mathematics, chemistry, and so on. As we embark on the journey to apply the knowledge from other fields to finance, we need to be aware that finance is Simply Too Complex, since all of finance, through time, has involved three simple outcomes - "Buy, Sell or Hold". The complications are mainly to get to these results.

Definition 1. ***Market Microstructure is the investigation of the process and protocols that govern the exchange of assets with the objective of reducing frictions that can impede the transfer.***

In financial markets, where there is an abundance of recorded information, this translates to the study of the dynamic relationships between observed variables, such as price, volume and spread, and hidden constituents, such as transaction costs and volatility, that hold sway over the efficient functioning of the system (Kashyap 2015b).

While it might be possible to observe historical trends (or other attributes) and make comparisons across fewer number of entities, in large systems where there are numerous components or contributing elements,

this can be a daunting task. If time travel were to become possible, time series would no longer be relevant. We are accustomed to using time and money as our units of measurement. Time and money are but means to an end. If we start viewing efforts and the world in terms of what we hope to accomplish ultimately, it might lead to better results.

In this present paper, we put aside the fundamental question of whether we need complicated models or merely better morals and present quantitative measures across aggregations of smaller elements that can aid decision makers by providing simple yet powerful metrics to compare groups of entities. The results draw upon sources from statistics, probability, economics / finance, communication systems, pattern recognition and information theory; becoming one example of how elements of different fields can be combined to provide answers to the questions raised by a particular field. The degree to which different markets or sub groups of securities have different measures of their corresponding distributions tells us the extent to which they are different. This can aid investors looking for diversification or looking for more of the same thing.

2.4 Nuggets of Knowledge from Buckets of Nonsense

Necessity is the mother of all invention / creation / innovation, but the often forgotten father is frustration. In this age of (Too Much) Information, it is imperative to uncover nuggets of knowledge from buckets of nonsense.

To aid in this effort to extract meaning from chaos, we summarize the application of the theoretical results from (Kashyap 2016b) to microstructure studies. The central concept rests on a novel methodology based on the marriage between the Bhattacharyya distance, a measure of similarity across distributions, and the Johnson Lindenstrauss Lemma, a technique for dimension reduction, providing us with a simple yet powerful tool that allows comparisons between data-sets representing any two distributions, perhaps also becoming, to our limited knowledge, an example of perfect matrimony.

We return to Sergei Bubka, our Icon of Uncertainty (Kashyap 2016a). As a refresher for the younger generation, he broke the pole vault world record 35 times. We can think of regulatory change or the utilization of newer methods and techniques as raising the bar. Each time the bar is raised, the spirit of Sergei Bubka, in all of us, will find a way over it. The varying behavior of participants in a social system will give rise to unintended consequences (Kashyap 2016e) and as long as participants are free to observe the results and modify their actions, this effect will persist. (Kashyap 2015a) consider ways to reduce the complexity of social systems, which could be one way to mitigate the effect of unintended outcomes. While attempts at designing less complex systems are worthy endeavors, reduced complexity might be hard to accomplish in certain instances and despite successfully reducing complexity, alternate techniques at dealing with uncertainty are commendable complementary pursuits (Kashyap 2016d).

Asset price bubbles are seductive but scary when they burst. What we learn from the story of Beauty and the Beast is that they must coexist; we need to learn to love the beast before we can uncover the beauty. Similarly bubbles and busts must be close to one another. If we find that microstructure variables, especially implicit trading costs, are showing steady movement, the change in transaction costs could be a signal of a potential building up of a bubble and a later bust. Our study will allow the comparison of trading costs across aggregations of individual securities, allowing inferences to be drawn across sectors or markets, enabling us to find early indications of bubbles building up in corners of the economy.

2.5 The Miracle of Mathematics

Lastly on a cautionary note, since the concepts mentioned below involve non-trivial mathematical principles, we point out that the source of most (all) human conflict (and misunderstanding) is not because of what is said (written) and heard (read), but is partly due to how something is said and mostly because of the difference between what is said and heard and what is meant and understood. We list a few different ways of describing what mathematics is and perhaps why it is miraculously magical most of the time but minutiae some times, that could be relegated to an appendix to be safely ignored.

1. Mathematics is built on one simple operation, addition, making it a fractal with addition as its starting point.
2. Mathematics has become complex because of the confusion that different notations, assumptions not made explicit and missed steps can create.
3. Mathematics without the steps is like a treasure hunt without the clues.
4. Mathematics is like a swimsuit model wearing a Burkha; we need to see beyond the symbols and the surface to appreciate the beauty.

In a complex system, deriving equations can be a daunting exercise, and not to mention, of limited practical validity. Hence, to supplements equations, we need to envision the numerous unknowns that can cause equations to go awry; while remembering that a candle in the dark is better than nothing at all. Pondering on the sources of uncertainty and the tools we have to capture it, might lead us to believe that, either, the level of our mathematical knowledge is not advanced enough, or, we are using the wrong methods. The dichotomy between logic and randomness is a topic for another time.

3 Methodological Fundamentals

3.1 Notation and Terminology for Key Results

- $D_{BC}\left(p_i, p_i'\right)$, the Bhattacharyya Distance between two multinomial populations each consisting of k categories classes with associated probabilities $p_1, p_2, ..., p_k$ and $p_1', p_2', ..., p_k'$ respectively.
- $\rho\left(p_i, p_i'\right)$, the Bhattacharyya Coefficient.
- $D_{BC-N}(p, q)$ is the Bhattacharyya distance between p and q normal distributions or classes.
- $D_{BC-MN}\left(p_1, p_2\right)$ is the Bhattacharyya distance between two multivariate normal distributions, $\boldsymbol{p_1}, \boldsymbol{p_2}$ where $\boldsymbol{p_i} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_i,\, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i)$.
- $D_{BC-TN}(p, q)$ is the Bhattacharyya distance between p and q truncated normal distributions or classes.
- $D_{BC-TMN}\left(p_1, p_2\right)$ is the Bhattacharyya distance between two truncated multivariate normal distributions, $\boldsymbol{p_1}, \boldsymbol{p_2}$ where $\boldsymbol{p_i} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_i,\, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i,\, \boldsymbol{a}_i,\, \boldsymbol{b}_i)$.

3.2 Bhattacharyya Distance

We use the Bhattacharyya distance (Bhattacharyya 1943, 1946) as a measure of similarity or dissimilarity between the probability distributions of the two entities we are looking to compare. These entities could be two securities, groups of securities, markets or any statistical populations that we are interested in studying. The Bhattacharyya distance is defined as the negative logarithm of the Bhattacharyya coefficient.

$$D_{BC}\left(p_i, p_i'\right) = -\ln\left[\rho\left(p_i, p_i'\right)\right]$$

The Bhattacharyya coefficient is calculated as shown below for discrete and continuous probability distributions.

$$\rho\left(p_i, p_i'\right) = \sum_{i}^{k} \sqrt{p_i p_i'}$$

$$\rho\left(p_i, p_i'\right) = \int \sqrt{p_i\left(x\right) p_i'\left(x\right)} dx$$

Bhattacharyya's original interpretation of the measure was geometric (Derpanis 2008). He considered two multinomial populations each consisting of k categories classes with associated probabilities $p_1, p_2, ..., p_k$ and $p_1', p_2', ..., p_k'$ respectively. Then, as $\sum_i^k p_i = 1$ and $\sum_i^k p_i' = 1$, he noted that $(\sqrt{p_1}, ..., \sqrt{p_k})$ and $(\sqrt{p_1'}, ..., \sqrt{p_k'})$ could be considered as the direction cosines of two vectors in $k-$dimensional space referred to a system of

orthogonal co-ordinate axes. As a measure of divergence between the two populations Bhattacharyya used the square of the angle between the two position vectors. If θ is the angle between the vectors then:

$$\rho\left(p_i, p_i'\right) = cos\theta = \sum_{i}^{k} \sqrt{p_i p_i'}$$

Thus if the two populations are identical: $cos\theta = 1$ corresponding to $\theta = 0$, hence we see the intuitive motivation behind the definition as the vectors are co-linear. Bhattacharyya further showed that by passing to the limiting case a measure of divergence could be obtained between two populations defined in any way given that the two populations have the same number of variates. The value of coefficient then lies between 0 and 1.

$$0 \leq \rho\left(p_i, p_i'\right) \leq = 1$$

$$0 \leq D_{BC}\left(p_i, p_i'\right) \leq \infty$$

We get the following formulae (Lee and Bretschneider 2012) for the Bhattacharyya distance when applied to the case of two uni-variate normal distributions.

$$D_{BC-N}(p,q) = \frac{1}{4}\ln\left(\frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{\sigma_p^2}{\sigma_q^2} + \frac{\sigma_q^2}{\sigma_p^2} + 2\right)\right) + \frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{(\mu_p - \mu_q)^2}{\sigma_p^2 + \sigma_q^2}\right)$$

σ_p is the variance of the $p-$th distribution,

μ_p is the mean of the $p-$th distribution, and

p, q are two different distributions.

The original paper on the Bhattacharyya distance (Bhattacharyya 1943) mentions a natural extension to the case of more than two populations. For an M population system, each with k random variates, the definition of the coefficient becomes,

$$\rho\left(p_1, p_2, ..., p_M\right) = \int \cdots \int \left[p_1\left(x\right) p_2\left(x\right) ... p_M\left(x\right)\right]^{\frac{1}{M}} dx_1 \cdots dx_k$$

For two multivariate normal distributions, $\boldsymbol{p_1}, \boldsymbol{p_2}$ where $\boldsymbol{p_i} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_i, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i)$,

$$D_{BC-MN}\left(p_1, p_2\right) = \frac{1}{8}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2)^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2) + \frac{1}{2}\ln\left(\frac{\det \boldsymbol{\Sigma}}{\sqrt{\det \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 \, \det \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2}}\right),$$

$\boldsymbol{\mu}_i$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i$ are the means and covariances of the distributions, and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \frac{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2}{2}$. We need to keep in mind that a discrete sample could be stored in matrices of the form A and B, where, n is the number of

observations and m denotes the number of variables captured by the two matrices.

$$\boldsymbol{A_{m\times n}} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\boldsymbol{\mu_1}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma_1}\right)$$

$$\boldsymbol{B_{m\times n}} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\boldsymbol{\mu_2}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma_2}\right)$$

3.3 Dimension Reduction

A key requirement to apply the Bhattacharyya distance in practice is to have data-sets with the same number of dimensions. (Fodor 2002; Burges 2009; Sorzano, Vargas and Montano 2014) are comprehensive collections of methodologies aimed at reducing the dimensions of a data-set using Principal Component Analysis or Singular Value Decomposition and related techniques. (Johnson and Lindenstrauss 1984) proved a fundamental result (JL Lemma) that says that any n point subset of Euclidean space can be embedded in $k = O(log\frac{n}{\epsilon^2})$ dimensions without distorting the distances between any pair of points by more than a factor of $(1 \pm \epsilon)$, for any $0 < \epsilon < 1$. Whereas principal component analysis is only useful when the original data points are inherently low dimensional, the JL Lemma requires absolutely no assumption on the original data. Also, note that the final data points have no dependence on d, the dimensions of the original data which could live in an arbitrarily high dimension. We use the version of the bounds for the dimensions of the transformed subspace given in (Frankl and Maehara 1988; 1990; Dasgupta and Gupta 1999).

Lemma 1. *For any $0 < \epsilon < 1$ and any integer n, let k be a positive integer such that*

$$k \geq 4\left(\frac{\epsilon^2}{2} - \frac{\epsilon^3}{3}\right)^{-1} \ln n$$

Then for any set V of n points in $\boldsymbol{R}^d$, there is a map $f : \boldsymbol{R}^d \to \boldsymbol{R}^k$ such that for all $u, v \in V$,

$$(1-\epsilon)\left\|u-v\right\|^2 \leq \left\|f\left(u\right) - f\left(v\right)\right\|^2 \leq (1+\epsilon)\left\|u-v\right\|^2$$

Furthermore, this map can be found in randomized polynomial time and one such map is $f = \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}Ax$ where, $x \in \boldsymbol{R}^d$ and A is a $k \times d$ matrix in which each entry is sampled i.i.d from a Gaussian $N\left(0,1\right)$ distribution.

(Kashyap 2016b) provides expressions for the density functions after dimension transformation when considering log normal distributions, truncated normal and truncated multivariate normal distributions (Appendix A: 8). These results are applicable in the context of many variables observed in real life such as stock prices, heart rates and volatilities, which do not take on negative values. For completeness, we also include the expression for the dimension transformed normal distribution. A relationship between covariance and

distance measures is also derived. An asset pricing and one biological application show the limitless possibilities such a comparison affords. Some pointers for implementation and R code snippets for the Johnson Lindenstrauss matrix transformation and a modification to the routine currently available to calculate the Bhattacharyya distance are also listed. This modification allows much larger numbers and dimensions to be handled, by utilizing the properties of logarithms and the eigen values of a matrix.

4 From Symbols to Numbers, Empirical Illustrations across Markets

We illustrate several examples of how this measure could be used to compare different countries based on the time series variables across all equity securities traded in that market. Our data sample contains prices (open, close, high and low) and trading volumes for most of the securities from six different markets from Jan 01, 2014 to May 28, 2014 (Figure 1a). Singapore with 566 securities is the market with the least number of traded securities. Even if we reduce the dimension of all the other markets with more number of securities, for a proper comparison of these markets, we would need more than two years worth of data. Hence as a simplification, we first reduce the dimension of the matrix holding the prices or volumes for each market using principal component analysis (PCA; see Shlens 2014) reduction, so that the number of tickers retained would be comparable to the number of days for which we have data. We report the results of using distance measures over the full sample after PCA reduction.

We report the full matrix and not just the upper or lower matrix since the PCA reduction we do takes the first country, reduces the dimensions upto a certain number of significant digits and then reduces the dimension of the second country to match the number of dimensions of the first country. For example, this would mean that comparing AUS and SGP is not exactly the same as comparing SGP and AUS. As a safety step before calculating the distance, which requires the same dimensions for the structures holding data for the two entities being compared, we could perform dimension reduction using JL Lemma if the dimensions of the two countries differs after the PCA reduction. We repeat the calculations for different number of significant digits of the PCA reduction. This shows the fine granularity of the results that our distance comparison produces and highlights the issue that with PCA reduction there is loss of information, since with different number of significant digits employed in the PCA reduction, we get the result that different markets are similar.

We illustrate another example, where we compare a randomly selected sub universe of securities in each market, so that the number of tickers retained would be comparable to the number of days for which we have data. This approach could also be used when groups of securities are being compared within the same

market, a very common scenario when deciding on the group of securities to invest in a market as opposed to deciding which markets to invest in. Such an approach would be highly useful for index construction or comparison across sectors within a market.

We report the full matrix for the same reason as explained earlier and perform multiple iterations when reducing the dimension using the JL Lemma. A key observation is that the magnitude of the distances are very different when using PCA reduction and when using dimension reduction, due to the loss of information that comes with the PCA technique. It is apparent that using dimension reduction via the JL Lemma produces consistent results, since the same pairs of markets are seen to be similar in different iterations. It is worth remembering that in each iteration of the JL Lemma dimension transformation we multiply by a different random matrix and hence the distance is slightly different in each iteration but within the bound established by JL Lemma. When the distance is somewhat close between two pairs of entities, we could observe an inconsistency due to the JL Lemma transformation in successive iterations.

Lastly, we calculate sixty day moving volatilities on the close price and trading volume and calculate the distance measure over the full sample and also across each of the randomly selected sub-samples.

4.1 Speaking Volumes Of: Comparison of Trading Volumes

The results of the volume comparison over the full sample are shown in Figure 1b. For example, in Figure 1b, AUS - GBR are the most similar markets when two significant digits are used and AUS - GBR are the most similar with six significant digits. In this case the PCA and JL Lemma dimension reduction give similar results.

The random sample results are shown in Figure 2. The left table (Figure 2a) is for PCA reduction on a randomly chosen sub universe and the right table (Figure 2b) is for dimension reduction using JL Lemma for the same sub universe.

Trading Country	Distinct Tickers
AUS	993
GBR	1497
HKG	698
IND	1562
JPN	3323
SGP	566

(a) Markets and Tickers Count

Sig Level=2	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	0.71	14.80	8.48	2.46	7.34
GBR	0.59	-	4.04	3.63	1.36	2.00
HKG	9.57	8.10	-	18.22	13.30	1.43
IND	4.34	5.66	18.22	-	1.57	13.53
JPN	0.64	1.47	8.33	1.00	-	5.65
SGP	5.05	3.70	1.32	12.71	8.24	-
Sig Level=3	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	1.31	26.12	20.02	7.42	9.82
GBR	0.74	-	15.76	9.70	2.74	7.47
HKG	19.41	20.04	-	43.24	30.94	3.83
IND	16.78	14.86	54.82	-	4.46	37.77
JPN	3.62	3.18	29.50	3.63	-	18.18
SGP	8.63	8.83	3.59	29.52	18.18	-
Sig Level=4	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	1.31	26.12	20.02	7.42	9.82
GBR	1.31	-	29.50	16.84	4.94	11.74
HKG	26.12	29.50	-	63.13	46.07	7.06
IND	20.02	16.84	63.13	-	4.87	42.32
JPN	7.42	4.94	46.07	4.87	-	26.05
SGP	9.80	11.66	6.87	41.85	25.78	-
Sig Level=5	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	1.31	26.12	20.02	7.42	9.82
GBR	1.31	-	29.50	16.84	4.94	11.74
HKG	26.12	29.50	-	63.13	46.07	7.06
IND	20.02	16.84	63.13	-	4.87	42.32
JPN	7.42	4.94	46.07	4.87	-	26.05
SGP	9.82	11.74	7.06	42.32	26.05	-
Sig Level=6	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	1.31	26.12	20.02	7.42	9.82
GBR	1.31	-	29.50	16.84	4.94	11.74
HKG	26.12	29.50	-	63.13	46.07	7.06
IND	20.02	16.84	63.13	-	4.87	42.32
JPN	7.42	4.94	46.07	4.87	-	26.05
SGP	9.82	11.74	7.06	42.32	26.05	-

(b) Volume PCA Dimension Reduction

Figure 1: Security Count by Market / Volume Distance Measures over Full Sample

Sig Level=2	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	0.18	1.41	5.17	8.89	5.13
GBR	0.18	-	2.20	3.97	7.57	6.32
HKG	1.22	1.72	-	5.14	7.44	1.63
IND	3.35	2.47	6.38	-	1.02	10.36
JPN	5.39	4.52	8.41	0.90	-	12.07
SGP	3.29	3.72	1.49	5.71	6.90	-
Sig Level=3	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	4.19	1.85	15.37	24.12	7.40
GBR	0.44	-	3.07	6.24	11.08	8.35
HKG	1.54	2.48	-	10.62	14.99	2.18
IND	7.80	5.90	12.35	-	1.56	18.23
JPN	10.66	9.07	14.99	1.43	-	20.35
SGP	4.25	5.07	1.71	9.42	12.07	-
Sig Level=4	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	14.76	2.28	30.50	43.97	8.88
GBR	2.58	-	5.97	7.21	14.00	12.79
HKG	1.88	8.80	-	22.46	31.90	2.93
IND	15.37	7.44	21.42	-	3.09	29.57
JPN	18.98	13.52	24.62	2.29	-	32.37
SGP	6.47	9.00	2.56	20.57	26.21	-
Sig Level=5	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	55.70	5.45	44.78	55.94	40.58
GBR	6.77	-	11.21	7.71	17.10	18.42
HKG	1.96	15.74	-	31.47	45.27	2.95
IND	21.11	7.78	27.82	-	4.60	36.03
JPN	28.28	16.64	35.05	3.73	-	43.38
SGP	7.40	15.18	2.93	29.57	38.60	-
Sig Level=6	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	55.72	46.92	45.68	66.87	40.66
GBR	11.28	-	15.74	8.06	19.60	22.69
HKG	1.96	17.74	-	34.97	48.87	3.54
IND	24.80	8.06	31.47	-	5.33	39.44
JPN	36.55	19.02	43.51	5.07	-	51.61
SGP	7.53	20.22	2.93	36.03	48.31	-

(a) Volume PCA Dimension Reduction

Iteration=1	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	84.81	76.82	85.01	88.46	65.64
GBR	93.91	-	94.34	82.85	82.30	91.94
HKG	74.70	87.92	-	82.37	93.98	70.89
IND	91.10	81.72	82.37	-	62.41	89.73
JPN	90.30	87.39	98.24	61.81	-	97.81
SGP	69.21	89.96	69.95	85.73	98.17	-
Iteration=2	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	81.86	78.23	96.07	90.57	70.70
GBR	90.42	-	92.18	78.68	87.65	90.18
HKG	67.18	92.73	-	82.37	95.56	72.50
IND	85.54	81.43	82.37	-	62.35	86.19
JPN	82.29	85.22	92.64	61.67	-	97.58
SGP	71.25	89.07	76.35	88.51	96.66	-
Iteration=3	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	91.33	67.99	87.39	86.02	64.20
GBR	91.75	-	93.97	80.84	84.74	92.59
HKG	73.46	95.92	-	82.37	96.44	72.98
IND	86.44	80.28	82.37	-	62.12	85.65
JPN	92.56	84.56	95.61	63.02	-	102.12
SGP	63.40	89.66	69.56	86.12	96.98	-
Iteration=4	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	78.91	72.97	83.66	90.74	64.95
GBR	81.57	-	92.61	80.52	84.93	93.73
HKG	69.17	91.17	-	82.37	96.88	67.78
IND	86.65	82.47	82.37	-	62.77	91.47
JPN	83.34	85.57	96.62	63.14	-	97.85
SGP	66.94	92.89	74.65	84.17	96.33	-
Iteration=5	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	84.48	71.55	83.71	90.53	72.69
GBR	80.39	-	89.52	78.57	86.37	91.60
HKG	79.32	92.58	-	82.37	92.38	71.09
IND	91.27	83.53	82.37	-	63.25	85.50
JPN	91.05	86.06	98.11	62.77	-	95.25
SGP	65.91	91.14	68.00	89.46	95.75	-

(b) Volume JL Lemma Dimension Reduction

Figure 2: Volume Distance Measures over Randomly Chosen Sub Universe

4.2 A Pricey Prescription: Comparison of Prices (Open, Close, High and Low)

4.2.1 Open Close

The results of a comparison between open and close prices over the full sample are shown in Figures 3, 3a, 3b. For example, in Figure 3b, AUS - SGP are the most similar markets when two significant digits are used and AUS - HKG are the most similar with six significant digits. The similarities between open and close prices, in terms of the distance measure, are also easily observed.

The random sample results are shown in Figures 4, 5. The left table (Figures 4a, 5a) is for PCA reduction on a randomly chosen sub universe and the right table (Figures 4b, 5b) is for dimension reduction using JL Lemma for the same sub universe. In Figure 5b, AUS - IND are the most similar in iteration one and also in iteration five.

Sig Level=2	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	0.14	0.13	0.18	0.20	0.03
GBR	0.44	-	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.80
HKG	0.49	0.02	-	0.07	0.04	0.99
IND	1.28	0.07	0.07	-	0.02	2.01
JPN	1.20	0.05	0.04	0.02	-	1.92
SGP	0.03	0.23	0.23	0.27	0.29	-
Sig Level=3	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	1.50	1.53	2.17	2.02	0.26
GBR	6.74	-	0.21	0.39	0.10	19.10
HKG	3.91	0.06	-	0.42	0.14	10.50
IND	14.44	0.59	2.26	-	0.24	37.46
JPN	10.35	0.12	0.82	0.22	-	28.88
SGP	0.22	2.33	2.38	3.03	2.87	-
Sig Level=4	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	7.63	5.93	10.76	8.85	7.63
GBR	15.77	-	1.90	0.97	0.26	57.92
HKG	8.16	1.29	-	3.46	2.14	37.90
IND	21.98	0.97	4.89	-	0.33	65.00
JPN	18.58	0.26	3.15	0.33	-	61.14
SGP	1.49	7.44	7.21	9.13	8.30	-
Sig Level=5	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	15.77	9.28	21.98	18.58	28.21
GBR	15.77	-	1.90	0.97	0.26	57.92
HKG	9.28	1.90	-	4.89	3.15	49.67
IND	21.98	0.97	4.89	-	0.33	65.00
JPN	18.58	0.26	3.15	0.33	-	61.14
SGP	6.55	20.11	18.26	23.56	21.47	-
Sig Level=6	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	15.77	9.28	21.98	18.58	28.21
GBR	15.77	-	1.90	0.97	0.26	57.92
HKG	9.28	1.90	-	4.89	3.15	49.67
IND	21.98	0.97	4.89	-	0.33	65.00
JPN	18.58	0.26	3.15	0.33	-	61.14
SGP	13.59	34.11	29.74	39.03	36.17	-

(a) Open PCA Dimension Reduction

Sig Level=2	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	0	0.14	0.13	0.17	0.19	0.03
GBR	0.43	0	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.78
HKG	0.51	0.01	0	0.06	0.03	0.95
IND	1.58	0.1	0.1	0	0.03	2.32
JPN	1.16	0.04	0.03	0.03	0	1.79
SGP	0.03	0.23	0.23	0.25	0.27	0
Sig Level=3	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	0	1.24	1.34	2.02	1.72	0.18
GBR	3.83	0	0.03	0.51	0.2	10.15
HKG	3.64	0.03	0	0.41	0.15	9.01
IND	11.81	1.06	1.54	0	0.13	29.21
JPN	9.86	0.53	0.9	0.13	0	26.1
SGP	0.18	2.1	2.22	2.98	2.65	0
Sig Level=4	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	0	5.71	5.43	9.86	8.39	6.28
GBR	11.49	0	0.73	1.94	1.52	48.06
HKG	7.39	0.43	0	2.89	2.34	32.92
IND	20.54	2.05	4.45	0	0.13	60.42
JPN	19.12	1.64	4.02	0.13	0	58.73
SGP	1.68	7.67	7.84	10.21	9.19	0
Sig Level=5	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	0	11.49	8.43	19.89	18.47	24.16
GBR	11.81	0	0.75	2.05	1.64	50.11
HKG	8.63	0.75	0	4.45	4.02	45.78
IND	20.54	2.05	4.45	0	0.13	60.42
JPN	19.12	1.64	4.02	0.13	0	58.73
SGP	5.82	17.15	16.82	22.01	20.32	0
Sig Level=6	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	0	11.81	8.63	20.54	19.12	25.58
GBR	11.81	0	0.75	2.05	1.64	50.11
HKG	8.63	0.75	0	4.45	4.02	45.78
IND	20.54	2.05	4.45	0	0.13	60.42
JPN	19.12	1.64	4.02	0.13	0	58.73
SGP	13.42	31.43	29.24	38.88	37.01	0

(b) Close PCA Dimension Reduction

Figure 3: Open / Close Distance Measures over Full Sample

Sig Level=2	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	0.61	1.47	2.48	0.07	9.13
GBR	3.62	-	0.44	1.55	1.03	18.37
HKG	1.89	0.42	-	0.78	1.69	14.29
IND	5.57	1.52	1.18	-	3.83	20.31
JPN	1.05	0.89	1.82	3.83	-	13.64
SGP	10.36	12.91	14.29	15.86	10.65	-
Sig Level=3	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	1.38	2.31	4.24	0.33	11.41
GBR	12.34	-	0.47	1.95	2.04	30.83
HKG	7.95	0.46	-	1.39	2.34	24.91
IND	20.45	2.23	1.80	-	7.04	40.52
JPN	8.79	2.10	2.98	6.64	-	26.21
SGP	13.90	30.83	31.93	36.40	24.81	-
Sig Level=4	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	2.40	3.24	5.57	1.05	11.87
GBR	26.29	-	0.64	3.70	2.91	48.79
HKG	22.40	0.52	-	2.36	3.71	44.14
IND	40.97	4.38	2.83	-	12.01	64.91
JPN	17.78	2.81	4.19	10.11	-	38.40
SGP	15.42	51.81	54.53	62.91	41.97	-
Sig Level=5	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	9.90	10.44	14.16	6.04	13.48
GBR	33.29	-	1.30	5.43	3.30	57.35
HKG	40.62	2.09	-	3.11	6.94	65.40
IND	52.11	7.27	3.20	-	15.37	77.25
JPN	25.20	3.31	6.54	14.27	-	47.78
SGP	15.76	61.71	68.54	77.95	51.10	-
Sig Level=6	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	21.25	22.40	28.96	14.72	14.95
GBR	36.23	-	2.50	7.27	3.34	60.73
HKG	42.22	2.50	-	3.20	7.24	67.15
IND	52.11	7.27	3.20	-	15.37	77.25
JPN	28.09	3.34	7.41	15.43	-	51.10
SGP	15.78	75.73	73.67	88.79	63.77	-

(a) Open PCA Dimension Reduction

Iteration=1	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	147,332	357,105	72,252	447,338	11,760,081
GBR	64,024	-	23,900	6,985	29,057	733,083
HKG	263,487	49,759	-	15,888	20,577	563,200
IND	82,491	14,386	9,684	-	5,029	61,990
JPN	426,948	13,373	13,078	7,474	-	11,441
SGP	7,879,885	854,575	671,440	69,954	8,488	-
Iteration=2	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	79,232	437,898	34,660	723,681	10,352,861
GBR	83,584	-	22,291	14,406	16,543	505,788
HKG	261,184	25,308	-	18,538	35,131	362,887
IND	44,316	13,045	25,246	-	7,986	65,117
JPN	120,124	16,647	26,602	7,153	-	9,187
SGP	9,594,568	561,372	664,757	71,920	17,134	-
Iteration=3	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	159,101	78,753	63,290	438,398	7,680,674
GBR	173,521	-	25,823	7,215	17,145	907,660
HKG	290,054	28,928	-	11,158	26,866	546,871
IND	97,118	7,770	10,263	-	9,279	63,926
JPN	726,018	19,079	13,403	6,391	-	13,355
SGP	5,556,248	516,818	742,894	68,860	22,389	-
Iteration=4	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	137,104	212,410	39,547	603,107	8,457,391
GBR	142,636	-	35,139	12,768	17,116	669,073
HKG	205,720	19,393	-	11,048	20,371	478,788
IND	50,186	12,734	16,334	-	7,315	58,361
JPN	233,014	21,248	19,775	12,809	-	14,787
SGP	18,167,921	781,053	618,734	61,358	34,356	-
Iteration=5	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	152,307	60,820	64,520	242,028	17,000,095
GBR	332,989	-	31,501	7,566	26,028	925,237
HKG	221,826	38,972	-	19,559	31,486	432,616
IND	99,696	9,554	9,488	-	6,775	65,333
JPN	258,864	14,837	34,881	5,165	-	14,320
SGP	8,304,606	510,917	720,135	62,932	10,476	-

(b) Open JL Lemma Dimension Reduction

Figure 4: Open Distance Measures over Randomly Chosen Sub Universe

Sig Level=2	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	0.46	1.24	3.68	0.33	11.53
GBR	0.76	-	0.61	2.50	0.15	15.07
HKG	1.19	0.52	-	0.61	0.60	10.98
IND	6.27	2.86	2.76	-	3.55	22.34
JPN	0.33	0.13	0.60	2.58	-	12.81
SGP	13.14	16.78	17.64	22.34	16.05	-
Sig Level=3	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	0.76	1.40	4.61	0.51	12.72
GBR	11.89	-	0.70	4.11	0.29	30.39
HKG	3.37	0.65	-	3.06	0.61	19.28
IND	18.04	3.97	4.27	-	5.23	37.14
JPN	8.29	0.26	0.62	4.96	-	25.63
SGP	14.95	36.87	37.18	47.71	35.12	-
Sig Level=4	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	1.74	2.25	6.27	1.38	13.14
GBR	24.90	-	0.72	6.45	0.32	46.38
HKG	16.95	0.70	-	5.24	0.64	37.18
IND	45.77	7.96	7.69	-	8.81	68.97
JPN	25.00	0.33	0.64	8.03	-	46.35
SGP	15.50	54.64	56.21	73.24	54.33	-
Sig Level=5	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	8.00	8.09	14.53	7.01	14.11
GBR	32.32	-	0.98	9.05	0.66	54.64
HKG	32.05	0.89	-	7.93	0.64	54.71
IND	82.09	35.77	45.20	-	12.44	94.43
JPN	40.99	34.98	3.47	10.81	-	62.56
SGP	15.57	69.76	61.37	89.41	65.97	-
Sig Level=6	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	18.32	18.30	28.66	16.92	15.02
GBR	33.36	-	1.26	9.91	0.97	55.66
HKG	35.16	1.26	-	8.57	0.66	57.79
IND	82.75	35.32	45.23	-	14.54	90.87
JPN	67.92	33.70	44.20	13.26	-	73.36
SGP	53.10	69.58	81.46	99.74	73.36	-

(a) Close PCA Dimension Reduction

Iteration=1	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	365,776	3,126,158	65,659	400,769	9,217,218
GBR	286,251	-	31,881	33,362	37,242	1,700,993
HKG	3,126,158	30,127	-	16,991	46,078	1,220,842
IND	43,505	22,088	35,519	-	9,189	99,572
JPN	589,164	26,210	55,591	10,220	-	41,351
SGP	5,729,568	1,926,989	576,043	107,999	18,700	-
Iteration=2	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	502,738	3,126,158	47,601	590,959	15,982,109
GBR	390,306	-	57,608	28,398	19,858	1,093,510
HKG	3,126,158	38,845	-	27,608	56,726	1,411,575
IND	15,478	31,908	22,963	-	18,192	108,002
JPN	389,431	33,110	41,238	27,142	-	20,152
SGP	19,803,314	1,566,940	566,872	110,645	66,599	-
Iteration=3	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	286,825	3,126,158	54,458	214,268	11,175,458
GBR	194,775	-	54,441	37,736	38,338	2,074,430
HKG	3,126,158	62,178	-	21,746	52,694	1,117,187
IND	67,113	20,674	12,701	-	15,499	125,484
JPN	710,536	32,260	67,444	15,402	-	14,429
SGP	13,822,251	1,294,142	1,563,725	87,795	21,591	-
Iteration=4	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	206,720	3,126,158	61,146	499,663	9,905,841
GBR	249,784	-	48,265	10,018	24,967	2,782,083
HKG	3,126,158	57,661	-	30,326	37,593	1,363,929
IND	41,889	28,625	44,232	-	13,091	111,664
JPN	619,108	50,946	41,268	12,422	-	23,960
SGP	15,744,248	2,078,534	1,487,785	102,756	19,925	-
Iteration=5	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	486,768	3,126,158	81,682	752,027	13,373,157
GBR	175,751	-	54,761	24,935	22,663	2,689,089
HKG	3,126,158	54,559	-	38,806	40,914	544,276
IND	51,493	44,493	46,420	-	17,287	92,262
JPN	215,560	18,928	56,973	11,849	-	45,916
SGP	10,990,677	1,697,948	929,998	98,233	38,624	-

(b) Close JL Lemma Dimension Reduction

Figure 5: Close Distance Measures over Randomly Chosen Sub Universe

4.2.2 High Low

The results of a comparison between high and low prices over the full sample are shown in Figures 6, 6a, 6b. For example, in Figure 6a, AUS - SGP are the most similar markets when two significant digits are used and AUS - HKG are the most similar with six significant digits. The similarities between high and low prices are also easily observed.

The random sample results are shown in Figures 7, 8. The left table (Figures 7a, 8a) is for PCA reduction on a randomly chosen sub universe and the right table (Figures 7b, 8b) is for dimension reduction using JL Lemma for the same sub universe. In Figures 7b and 8b, AUS - IND are the most similar in iteration one and also in iteration five.

Sig Level=2	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	0.13	0.13	0.19	0.20	0.04
GBR	0.52	-	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.95
HKG	0.76	0.02	-	0.07	0.03	1.21
IND	1.31	0.06	0.07	-	0.02	1.79
JPN	1.19	0.04	0.03	0.02	-	1.66
SGP	0.04	0.23	0.24	0.29	0.29	-
Sig Level=3	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	1.40	1.51	2.07	1.88	0.11
GBR	5.81	-	0.23	0.27	0.08	8.41
HKG	3.33	0.06	-	0.28	0.10	3.74
IND	9.68	0.30	1.14	-	0.12	14.17
JPN	8.55	0.09	0.69	0.12	-	13.29
SGP	0.13	3.01	3.04	4.22	3.69	-
Sig Level=4	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	6.85	5.18	9.32	7.86	1.31
GBR	14.87	-	2.04	0.46	0.34	35.25
HKG	7.08	1.35	-	2.47	2.06	17.89
IND	19.42	0.51	3.84	-	0.14	41.57
JPN	18.45	0.43	3.69	0.14	-	40.51
SGP	0.58	7.34	6.30	9.54	8.23	-
Sig Level=5	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	14.87	8.37	18.87	17.82	11.51
GBR	15.21	-	2.07	0.51	0.43	36.99
HKG	8.56	2.07	-	3.84	3.69	28.67
IND	19.42	0.51	3.84	-	0.14	41.57
JPN	18.45	0.43	3.69	0.14	-	40.51
SGP	2.83	16.28	12.51	19.36	17.73	-
Sig Level=6	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	15.21	8.56	19.42	18.45	12.60
GBR	15.21	-	2.07	0.51	0.43	36.99
HKG	8.56	2.07	-	3.84	3.69	28.67
IND	19.42	0.51	3.84	-	0.14	41.57
JPN	18.45	0.43	3.69	0.14	-	40.51
SGP	6.68	26.12	19.77	29.74	28.38	-

(a) High PCA Dimension Reduction

Sig Level=2	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	0.12	0.13	0.17	0.19	0.03
GBR	0.54	-	0.01	0.04	0.02	0.94
HKG	0.49	0.01	-	0.06	0.03	0.90
IND	1.20	0.06	0.07	-	0.02	1.73
JPN	1.08	0.04	0.03	0.02	-	1.59
SGP	0.03	0.20	0.23	0.25	0.26	-
Sig Level=3	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	1.43	1.40	2.07	1.90	0.13
GBR	6.81	-	0.38	0.11	0.06	13.22
HKG	3.24	0.07	-	0.21	0.12	4.97
IND	8.62	0.11	0.71	-	0.04	16.17
JPN	8.51	0.06	0.65	0.04	-	16.60
SGP	0.14	3.00	2.89	3.83	3.56	-
Sig Level=4	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	7.13	5.07	8.28	7.82	2.69
GBR	17.13	-	2.42	0.14	0.13	44.01
HKG	7.62	1.68	-	2.12	2.12	24.82
IND	18.91	0.14	3.05	-	0.05	45.98
JPN	18.86	0.13	3.21	0.05	-	45.90
SGP	0.92	7.60	6.59	8.73	8.26	-
Sig Level=5	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	15.94	8.75	17.62	17.54	13.54
GBR	17.13	-	2.42	0.14	0.13	44.01
HKG	9.34	2.42	-	3.05	3.21	34.56
IND	18.91	0.14	3.05	-	0.05	45.98
JPN	18.86	0.13	3.21	0.05	-	45.90
SGP	3.96	17.72	14.23	19.07	18.57	-
Sig Level=6	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	17.13	9.34	18.91	18.86	15.70
GBR	17.13	-	2.42	0.14	0.13	44.01
HKG	9.34	2.42	-	3.05	3.21	34.56
IND	18.91	0.14	3.05	-	0.05	45.98
JPN	18.86	0.13	3.21	0.05	-	45.90
SGP	9.04	30.49	23.73	32.12	31.80	-

(b) Low PCA Dimension Reduction

Figure 6: High / Low Distance Measures over Full Sample

Sig Level=2	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	0.71	2.09	2.52	0.11	3.25
GBR	6.91	-	0.71	1.08	0.85	13.47
HKG	2.67	0.67	-	0.31	1.57	7.93
IND	4.92	1.05	0.41	-	2.43	10.70
JPN	2.45	0.56	1.67	2.60	-	8.06
SGP	0.01	0.16	1.08	0.84	0.02	-
Sig Level=3	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	1.18	2.67	3.34	0.35	4.16
GBR	18.46	-	0.74	1.83	1.68	26.24
HKG	9.44	0.72	-	0.58	2.00	16.30
IND	25.51	1.98	1.63	-	6.06	33.66
JPN	11.20	1.49	2.43	4.96	-	18.32
SGP	0.01	0.16	1.08	0.84	0.02	-
Sig Level=4	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	2.50	3.93	4.92	1.35	4.32
GBR	34.58	-	0.75	4.22	2.45	44.40
HKG	23.62	0.74	-	1.97	2.72	31.96
IND	56.37	5.95	5.68	-	14.07	67.04
JPN	25.46	2.40	3.20	10.09	-	34.68
SGP	0.94	1.48	2.50	2.47	1.10	-
Sig Level=5	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	9.67	10.81	12.92	6.69	4.70
GBR	45.68	-	1.13	6.86	3.33	56.59
HKG	39.75	0.75	-	4.91	3.65	50.07
IND	80.11	39.50	46.59	-	38.57	80.51
JPN	33.96	3.23	4.07	14.80	-	44.20
SGP	4.51	11.67	12.92	14.47	9.42	-
Sig Level=6	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	24.33	25.05	31.19	18.27	4.92
GBR	47.25	-	1.51	7.44	3.39	58.36
HKG	44.82	0.77	-	6.05	4.07	55.52
IND	78.98	39.21	46.10	-	38.22	79.26
JPN	37.96	3.45	4.60	17.19	-	48.86
SGP	4.80	26.24	27.15	31.61	20.90	-

(a) High PCA Dimension Reduction

Iteration=1	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	1,136,789	1,035,029	62,336	285,299	8,861,726
GBR	260,317	-	54,234	11,853	20,017	560,188
HKG	262,093	45,389	-	8,583	29,900	574,598
IND	21,578	11,494	15,910	-	14,096	49,364
JPN	210,287	20,528	22,761	18,787	-	20,877
SGP	6,290,821	233,946	1,059,991	121,144	15,969	-
Iteration=2	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	272,510	326,018	37,758	198,698	8,150,262
GBR	1,357,619	-	43,911	6,813	18,465	164,969
HKG	200,980	69,434	-	10,954	25,776	315,811
IND	121,515	16,390	12,922	-	14,461	145,572
JPN	363,923	29,124	32,262	14,606	-	7,711
SGP	13,814,434	304,504	305,510	83,479	31,267	-
Iteration=3	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	858,176	441,543	98,931	202,658	10,092,986
GBR	750,609	-	36,957	17,704	30,381	174,224
HKG	981,359	52,791	-	20,361	23,209	506,752
IND	43,493	28,691	25,489	-	23,532	84,349
JPN	384,847	20,335	29,712	10,567	-	19,023
SGP	12,652,910	456,558	844,319	86,701	6,604	-
Iteration=4	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	318,293	569,600	75,164	238,532	4,742,125
GBR	606,041	-	55,490	17,544	32,817	379,511
HKG	495,372	27,143	-	13,924	29,809	950,869
IND	64,320	13,531	23,475	-	18,880	35,207
JPN	330,397	15,052	22,570	8,377	-	25,638
SGP	14,465,992	245,619	241,314	34,732	19,457	-
Iteration=5	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	183,034	874,949	21,725	357,254	11,238,310
GBR	569,244	-	64,096	20,076	31,230	194,679
HKG	624,445	27,196	-	28,036	38,832	675,894
IND	54,740	19,631	11,161	-	21,869	72,540
JPN	334,172	11,263	28,547	20,940	-	10,348
SGP	6,452,800	291,636	259,187	103,512	15,874	-

(b) High JL Lemma Dimension Reduction

Figure 7: High Distance Measures over Randomly Chosen Sub Universe

Sig Level=2	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	0.73	2.04	2.97	0.25	5.19
GBR	7.03	-	0.71	2.18	1.00	17.55
HKG	2.46	0.68	-	0.45	1.46	10.44
IND	6.40	2.02	0.83	-	3.67	16.43
JPN	0.32	0.35	1.46	2.73	-	7.32
SGP	0.02	0.08	0.63	0.68	0.08	-
Sig Level=3	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	1.34	2.90	4.67	0.45	7.47
GBR	18.73	-	0.76	2.71	2.23	30.83
HKG	9.68	0.73	-	1.17	2.12	20.82
IND	19.97	2.44	1.40	-	6.40	32.05
JPN	6.58	1.48	2.27	5.36	-	16.90
SGP	0.02	0.08	0.63	0.68	0.08	-
Sig Level=4	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	1.34	2.90	4.67	0.45	7.47
GBR	35.43	-	0.77	3.64	3.39	48.98
HKG	24.41	0.76	-	1.94	3.35	37.05
IND	37.95	3.32	2.25	-	9.62	51.13
JPN	20.28	2.80	3.70	9.35	-	32.12
SGP	2.56	3.30	4.48	4.79	2.93	-
Sig Level=5	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	8.53	9.68	13.13	5.57	8.08
GBR	49.31	-	0.91	4.53	4.29	64.34
HKG	43.43	0.78	-	2.97	4.85	58.58
IND	57.60	4.38	3.19	-	13.30	73.44
JPN	32.85	3.92	4.95	12.92	-	47.20
SGP	7.83	13.96	15.79	18.52	11.69	-
Sig Level=6	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	20.22	21.44	26.99	14.27	8.33
GBR	73.79	-	1.25	40.39	4.79	63.99
HKG	48.68	0.80	-	3.36	5.11	64.60
IND	61.78	4.53	3.64	-	13.96	74.15
JPN	38.79	4.35	5.14	14.13	-	54.35
SGP	8.34	35.57	37.05	43.42	28.28	-

(a) Low PCA Dimension Reduction

Iteration=1	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	730,968	260,160	42,949	119,615	3,141,558
GBR	727,754	-	21,673	22,205	43,511	255,735
HKG	529,013	55,050	-	11,719	26,304	531,520
IND	37,621	17,579	11,282	-	12,847	61,039
JPN	121,720	40,337	31,205	7,666	-	32,840
SGP	4,559,242	189,211	434,402	61,039	12,514	-
Iteration=2	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	282,531	153,498	43,470	178,108	5,414,456
GBR	1,278,439	-	45,722	22,952	41,980	410,496
HKG	231,228	32,926	-	11,255	32,263	846,343
IND	63,492	10,607	17,175	-	7,040	61,039
JPN	151,883	36,875	28,303	5,930	-	16,353
SGP	5,045,445	374,646	284,311	61,039	26,401	-
Iteration=3	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	707,672	464,398	38,825	409,387	9,099,068
GBR	1,080,809	-	41,095	14,243	13,147	138,746
HKG	79,074	37,726	-	24,387	46,036	1,123,944
IND	31,139	34,849	21,067	-	9,882	61,039
JPN	160,496	15,568	53,609	9,250	-	13,068
SGP	8,406,786	305,797	716,506	61,039	13,597	-
Iteration=4	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	977,857	374,215	53,744	230,691	7,193,157
GBR	573,856	-	31,660	24,332	49,753	406,460
HKG	124,577	29,814	-	24,784	23,501	1,073,209
IND	107,403	19,574	18,487	-	15,592	61,039
JPN	144,123	31,802	46,399	10,054	-	7,446
SGP	8,732,192	213,074	508,333	61,039	24,479	-
Iteration=5	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	397,266	262,786	60,288	137,397	9,900,417
GBR	631,324	-	18,766	6,964	22,831	530,999
HKG	231,667	39,690	-	23,492	46,673	1,203,763
IND	53,796	26,806	8,340	-	10,841	61,039
JPN	76,818	29,587	25,712	15,652	-	19,338
SGP	6,575,871	419,610	146,474	61,039	18,501	-

(b) Low JL Lemma Dimension Reduction

Figure 8: Low Distance Measures over Randomly Chosen Sub Universe

4.3 Taming the (Volatility) Skew: Comparison of Close Price / Volume Volatilities

The results of a comparison between close price volatilities and volume volatilities over the full sample are shown in Figures 9, 9a, 9b. For example, in Figure 9a, AUS - GBR are the most similar markets when two significant digits are used and AUS - HKG are the most similar with six significant digits. In Figure 9b, AUS - GBR - IND are equally similar markets when two significant digits are used and AUS - GBR are the most similar with six significant digits. The difference in magnitudes of the distance measures for prices, volumes and volatilities is also easily observed. What this indicates is that, prices are from the most dissimilar or distant distributions, volatilities are less similar and volumes are from the most similar or overlapping distributions. As also observed in the volume comparisons, volume volatility comparisons give seemingly similar results when PCA or JL Lemma dimension reductions are used. By considering the price volatilities, and creating portfolios of instruments that have dissimilar volatility distributions, we could reduce the overall risk or variance of the portfolio returns, becoming one potential way of mitigating the effects of wild volatility swings.

The random sample results are shown in Figures 10, 11. The left table (Figures 10a, 11a) is for PCA reduction on a randomly chosen sub universe and the right table (Figures 10b, 11b) is for dimension reduction using JL Lemma for the same sub universe. In Figure 10b AUS - SGP are the most similar in iteration one and also in iteration five. In Figure 11b, AUS - SGP are the most similar in iteration one and AUS- GBR in iteration five.

Sig Level=2	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	0.02	0.10	0.28	0.12	0.38
GBR	0.02	-	0.04	0.16	0.05	0.40
HKG	0.09	0.04	-	0.06	0.02	0.62
IND	0.24	0.13	0.06	-	0.04	0.78
JPN	0.10	0.04	0.02	0.04	-	0.51
SGP	0.22	0.32	0.48	0.78	0.51	-
Sig Level=3	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	0.04	0.14	0.47	0.22	1.28
GBR	0.04	-	0.06	0.28	0.10	1.42
HKG	0.13	0.05	-	0.13	0.05	1.64
IND	0.41	0.24	0.12	-	0.05	2.17
JPN	0.21	0.10	0.05	0.06	-	1.91
SGP	0.88	1.11	1.45	2.17	1.68	-
Sig Level=4	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	0.32	0.51	1.07	0.60	3.46
GBR	0.38	-	0.07	0.37	0.12	5.83
HKG	0.55	0.07	-	0.18	0.06	6.23
IND	0.97	0.34	0.17	-	0.10	6.62
JPN	0.57	0.11	0.06	0.10	-	5.85
SGP	2.38	3.27	3.86	5.02	4.06	-
Sig Level=5	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	1.23	1.20	2.66	1.56	5.44
GBR	2.74	-	0.27	0.60	0.16	12.93
HKG	1.67	0.21	-	0.64	0.20	11.37
IND	4.87	0.60	0.90	-	0.25	17.05
JPN	3.47	0.18	0.39	0.26	-	14.73
SGP	5.24	9.11	9.65	12.25	10.27	-
Sig Level=6	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	3.06	2.25	5.64	3.88	6.04
GBR	3.06	-	0.28	0.72	0.22	13.76
HKG	2.25	0.28	-	1.06	0.43	13.06
IND	5.64	0.72	1.06	-	0.27	18.42
JPN	3.88	0.22	0.43	0.27	-	15.50
SGP	6.04	13.76	13.06	18.42	15.50	-

(a) Close Volatility PCA Dimension Reduction

Sig Level=2	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	0.01	0.43	0.01	0.62	0.11
GBR	0.01	-	0.42	0.02	0.61	0.07
HKG	0.43	0.52	-	0.33	0.03	0.88
IND	0.01	0.03	0.33	-	0.50	0.17
JPN	0.62	0.72	0.03	0.50	-	1.11
SGP	0.11	0.08	0.88	0.17	1.11	-
Sig Level=3	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	0.02	1.09	0.04	1.37	0.28
GBR	0.01	-	1.08	0.06	1.37	0.20
HKG	1.09	1.21	-	0.76	0.03	2.24
IND	0.04	0.07	0.72	-	0.96	0.46
JPN	1.46	1.60	0.03	1.06	-	2.79
SGP	0.31	0.27	2.57	0.58	2.97	-
Sig Level=4	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	0.02	2.29	0.10	2.65	0.65
GBR	0.02	-	2.20	0.13	2.54	0.51
HKG	2.22	2.40	-	1.46	0.04	4.79
IND	0.10	0.14	1.41	-	1.72	1.14
JPN	2.80	3.01	0.04	1.93	-	5.72
SGP	0.67	0.59	5.10	1.24	5.57	-
Sig Level=5	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	0.03	3.74	0.12	3.80	1.02
GBR	0.03	-	3.84	0.17	3.98	0.86
HKG	3.80	4.05	-	2.74	0.08	8.16
IND	0.12	0.17	2.69	-	2.73	1.74
JPN	4.01	4.26	0.10	2.85	-	8.59
SGP	1.09	0.97	8.48	1.85	8.40	-
Sig Level=6	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	0.03	4.20	0.14	4.15	1.12
GBR	0.03	-	4.40	0.18	4.36	1.02
HKG	4.20	4.40	-	3.00	0.10	8.90
IND	0.14	0.18	3.00	-	2.94	1.92
JPN	4.15	4.36	0.10	2.94	-	8.78
SGP	1.12	1.02	8.90	1.92	8.78	-

(b) Volume Volatility PCA Dimension Reduction

Figure 9: Close / Volume Volatility Distance Measures over Full Sample

Sig Level=2	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	0.88	0.17	0.67	1.42	0.89
GBR	1.04	-	1.24	4.10	0.31	0.09
HKG	0.18	1.21	-	0.80	1.97	1.27
IND	2.12	4.10	1.93	-	5.34	3.98
JPN	1.89	0.31	2.13	5.34	-	0.34
SGP	0.97	0.21	1.35	4.67	0.68	-
Sig Level=3	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	1.14	0.27	2.53	2.11	0.97
GBR	1.32	-	1.30	6.28	0.75	0.30
HKG	0.24	1.24	-	1.93	2.13	1.30
IND	2.90	5.55	3.19	-	7.39	4.87
JPN	2.88	0.61	2.44	8.61	-	1.20
SGP	0.98	0.33	1.56	5.39	1.81	-
Sig Level=4	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	1.35	0.57	3.32	3.37	0.98
GBR	1.58	-	1.35	7.06	2.06	0.47
HKG	0.38	1.27	-	3.51	2.40	1.39
IND	3.32	6.43	4.30	-	9.44	5.37
JPN	4.52	1.47	3.19	11.17	-	2.71
SGP	0.99	0.48	1.91	5.56	3.82	-
Sig Level=5	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	1.58	0.98	3.44	5.55	0.99
GBR	1.59	-	1.47	7.49	3.66	0.52
HKG	0.79	1.31	-	4.85	3.35	1.72
IND	3.43	6.98	4.99	-	11.98	5.51
JPN	6.41	2.77	3.92	13.80	-	4.53
SGP	1.02	0.52	2.08	5.85	5.47	-
Sig Level=6	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	1.59	1.14	3.67	6.79	1.02
GBR	3.99	-	1.80	8.27	43.65	0.70
HKG	1.14	1.45	-	5.84	4.16	2.07
IND	3.67	7.34	5.84	-	14.58	5.72
JPN	7.74	4.18	4.95	16.59	-	5.85
SGP	1.08	0.64	2.09	6.68	6.61	-

(a) Close Volatility PCA Dimension Reduction

Iteration=1	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	3,564	4,294	7,437	2,510	1,166
GBR	3,225	-	1,259	1,500	701	772
HKG	3,828	1,320	-	2,357	778	670
IND	3,625	2,544	2,588	-	2,384	1,156
JPN	7,939	827	1,248	3,291	-	1,532
SGP	5,071	772	889	1,189	874	-
Iteration=2	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	2,690	3,084	3,402	3,394	2,123
GBR	2,025	-	719	2,965	1,474	772
HKG	2,851	985	-	3,385	1,308	541
IND	2,859	2,899	2,801	-	3,723	2,009
JPN	3,711	1,303	934	3,189	-	828
SGP	2,694	772	715	1,099	1,077	-
Iteration=3	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	1,727	3,196	4,768	3,158	3,195
GBR	3,720	-	508	2,738	1,777	772
HKG	3,762	604	-	4,297	875	1,431
IND	5,539	996	3,746	-	2,703	1,611
JPN	5,393	1,764	948	2,676	-	1,310
SGP	2,435	772	675	2,354	1,210	-
Iteration=4	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	2,397	3,638	3,509	6,393	1,604
GBR	1,999	-	1,083	2,855	1,003	772
HKG	3,896	627	-	2,847	1,081	579
IND	6,069	1,698	3,401	-	2,502	1,901
JPN	4,050	1,332	1,910	4,238	-	1,137
SGP	2,106	772	580	923	837	-
Iteration=5	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	3,372	2,665	5,358	4,090	1,359
GBR	2,142	-	669	1,630	1,246	772
HKG	2,437	1,909	-	2,837	662	666
IND	5,617	2,073	2,886	-	3,338	1,485
JPN	4,786	1,074	540	4,378	-	704
SGP	2,583	772	776	1,217	1,006	-

(b) Close Volatility JL Lemma Dimension Reduction

Figure 10: Close Volatility Distance Measures over Randomly Chosen Sub Universe

Sig Level=2	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	0.05	0.58	0.15	0.70	0.14
GBR	0.05	-	0.79	0.24	0.96	0.07
HKG	0.49	0.72	-	0.29	0.04	0.88
IND	0.15	0.25	0.38	-	0.45	0.48
JPN	0.70	0.96	0.04	0.37	-	1.20
SGP	0.14	0.07	1.01	0.40	1.20	-
Sig Level=3	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	0.18	0.69	0.16	0.91	0.48
GBR	0.21	-	1.25	0.32	1.81	0.18
HKG	0.70	1.30	-	0.51	0.16	2.05
IND	0.24	0.34	0.65	-	1.14	0.87
JPN	0.96	1.69	0.11	0.74	-	2.40
SGP	0.71	0.20	2.05	0.78	2.84	-
Sig Level=4	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	0.53	0.78	0.39	1.31	1.54
GBR	0.55	-	1.97	0.35	3.05	0.41
HKG	0.80	2.02	-	1.18	0.25	3.75
IND	0.72	0.43	1.66	-	2.97	1.15
JPN	1.36	3.05	0.24	1.89	-	4.94
SGP	1.91	0.54	3.93	1.10	5.48	-
Sig Level=5	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	0.68	0.84	0.91	1.86	2.56
GBR	0.81	-	2.38	0.56	31.99	0.88
HKG	36.89	2.43	-	2.41	29.89	5.26
IND	34.23	0.87	2.71	-	28.22	32.62
JPN	1.72	3.84	0.39	3.23	-	6.84
SGP	2.96	0.88	5.17	1.15	31.38	-
Sig Level=6	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	0.89	0.86	1.46	32.29	3.08
GBR	36.75	-	2.44	0.87	31.07	36.10
HKG	35.62	43.30	-	2.95	30.49	38.19
IND	33.06	40.24	2.95	-	27.90	34.79
JPN	1.99	4.37	0.62	4.04	-	7.68
SGP	36.06	0.89	5.26	1.19	30.86	-

(a) Volume Volatility PCA Dimension Reduction

Iteration=1	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	7,763	6,535	8,149	5,664	4,812
GBR	6,875	-	3,043	5,474	5,797	7,534
HKG	5,941	3,043	-	4,935	8,760	3,560
IND	4,104	10,331	5,829	-	4,648	8,989
JPN	4,064	10,568	8,188	5,113	-	6,743
SGP	4,184	5,164	6,178	4,507	4,400	-
Iteration=2	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	3,702	7,378	4,910	7,247	10,018
GBR	7,525	-	3,043	5,821	7,454	9,053
HKG	5,573	3,043	-	4,302	6,469	7,147
IND	5,167	5,413	4,981	-	6,836	4,961
JPN	6,885	9,429	9,128	4,418	-	4,394
SGP	5,325	8,479	2,586	6,773	7,978	-
Iteration=3	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	5,185	7,671	5,267	7,528	5,057
GBR	6,172	-	3,043	8,065	9,304	4,471
HKG	5,240	3,043	-	10,982	14,587	5,191
IND	3,287	9,208	5,014	-	5,642	8,628
JPN	7,061	8,964	5,860	4,587	-	3,065
SGP	5,492	5,957	5,827	7,769	8,161	-
Iteration=4	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	4,914	4,807	5,403	6,821	3,615
GBR	9,158	-	3,043	4,686	3,566	4,035
HKG	5,655	3,043	-	4,997	7,552	4,085
IND	4,559	11,613	6,126	-	4,865	8,521
JPN	5,258	8,402	5,535	5,182	-	8,778
SGP	7,837	6,986	8,885	6,297	4,594	-
Iteration=5	AUS	GBR	HKG	IND	JPN	SGP
AUS	-	3,099	4,559	6,843	5,945	5,381
GBR	5,035	-	3,043	8,025	5,299	6,914
HKG	12,538	3,043	-	5,717	4,808	7,028
IND	8,141	12,006	4,641	-	5,296	5,811
JPN	5,536	7,473	3,719	8,451	-	4,109
SGP	5,770	4,704	3,833	2,778	6,316	-

(b) Volume Volatility JL Lemma Dimension Reduction

Figure 11: Volume Volatility Distance Measures over Randomly Chosen Sub Universe

5 Possibilities for Future Research

1. A key limitation of this study is that we have reduced dimensions using PCA or randomly sampled a sub matrix from the overall data-set so that the length of time series available is in the range of the number of securities that could be compared. Using a longer time series for the variables would be a useful extension and a real application would benefit immensely from more history.

2. We have used the simple formula for the Bhattacharyya distance applicable to multivariate normal distributions. The formulae we have developed over a truncated multivariate normal distribution or using a Normal Log-Normal Mixture could give more accurate results. Again, later works should look into tests that can establish which of the distributions would apply depending on the data-set under consideration.

3. For each market we have looked at seven variables, open, close, low, high, volume, close volatility and volume volatility. These variables can be combined using the expression for the multinomial distance to get a complete representation of which markets are more similar than others. We aim to develop this methodology and illustrate these techniques further in later works.

4. Once we have the similarity measures across groups of securities, portfolios could be constructed to see how sensitive they are to different explanatory factors and then performance benchmarks could be used to guage the risk return relationship.

6 Conclusions

We have discussed how the combination of the Bhattacharyya distance and the Johnson Lindenstrauss Lemma provides us with a practical and novel methodology that allows comparisons between any two probability distributions. This approach can help in the comparison of systems that generate prices, quantities and aid in the analysis of shopping patterns and understanding consumer behavior. The systems could be goods transacted at different shopping malls or trade flows across entire countries. Study of traffic congestion, road accidents and other fatalities across two regions could be performed to get an idea of similarities and seek common answers where such simplifications might be applicable. Clearly, this methodology lends itself to numerous applications outside the realm of finance and economics.

We have illustrated the comparison of prices, volumes and volatilities across six different markets from three continents demonstrating the power this methodology holds for big (small?) picture decision making.

In Indian mythology (End-note 13; Zimmer 1972; Doniger 1976; Rao 1993; Flood 1996; Parrinder 1997; Swami 2011), it is believed that in each era, God takes on an avatar or reincarnation to fight the main source of evil in that epoch and to restore the balance between good and bad. In this age of too much information and complexity, perhaps the supreme being needs to be born as a data scientist, conceivably with an apt superhero nickname, the Infoman (For society's fascination with superheroes or superhumans see: Eco and Chilton 1972; Reynolds 1992; Fingeroth 2004; Haslem, Ndalianis and Mackie 2007; Coogan 2009). Until higher powers intervene and provide the ultimate solution to completely eliminate information overload, we have to make do with marginal methods to reduce information, such as this composition.

As we wait for the perfect solution, it is worth meditating upon what superior beings would do when faced with a complex situation, such as the one we are in. It is said that the Universe is but the Brahma's (Creator's) dream (Barnett 1907; Ramamurthi 1995; Ghatage 2010). Research (Effort / Struggle) can help us understand this world; Sleep (Ease / Peace of Mind) can help us create our own world. We just need to be mindful that the most rosy and well intentioned dreams can have unintended consequences (Kashyap 2016e) and turn to nightmares (Nolan 2010; Lehrer 2010; Kashyap 2016f).

Native to Australia (End-note 15), "Koalas spend about 4.7 hours eating, 4 minutes traveling, 4.8 hours resting while awake and 14.5 hours sleeping in a 24-hour period" - (Nagy and Martin1985). See also (Smith 1979; Moyal 2008). The benefits of yoga on sleep quality are well documented (End-note 14; Cohen, Warneke,

Fouladi, Rodriguez and Chaoul-Reich 2004; Khalsa 2004; Manjunath and Telles 2005; Chen, Chen, Chao, Hung, Lin and Li 2009; Vera, Manzaneque, Maldonado, Carranque, Rodriguez, Blanca and Morell 2009).

A lesson from close by and down under: We need to "Do Some Yoga and Sleep Like A Koala" (Figure 12). With that, we present a list of sleeping aids in section 7.

Figure 12: Sleeping Like A Koala

7 Sleeping Aids (Notes and References)

1. Dr. Yong Wang, Dr. Isabel Yan, Dr. Vikas Kakkar, Dr. Fred Kwan, Dr. William Case, Dr. Srikant Marakani, Dr. Qiang Zhang, Dr. Costel Andonie, Dr. Jeff Hong, Dr. Guangwu Liu, Dr. Humphrey Tung and Dr. Xu Han at the City University of Hong Kong provided advice and more importantly encouragement to explore and where possible apply cross disciplinary techniques. The views and opinions expressed in this article, along with any mistakes, are mine alone and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of either of my affiliations or any other agency.

2. The Red Queen's race is an incident that appears in Lewis Carroll's Through the Looking-Glass and involves the Red Queen, a representation of a Queen in chess, and Alice constantly running but remaining in the same spot.

   "Well, in our country," said Alice, still panting a little, "you'd generally get to somewhere else, if you run very fast for a long time, as we've been doing."

   "A slow sort of country!" said the Queen. "Now, here, you see, it takes all the running you can do, to keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast as that!"

   The Red Queen's Race, Wikipedia Link

   This quote is commonly attributed as being from Alice in Wonderland as: "My dear, here we must run as fast as we can, just to stay in place. And if you wish to go anywhere you must run twice as fast as that."

3. Portfolio Manager, Wikipedia Link

4. Universal Computing Machine, Wikipedia Link

5. Computer, Wikipedia Link

6. MAC or Macintosh, Wikipedia Link

7. Personal Computer, Wikipedia Link

8. MAC vs MPC, Wikipedia Link

9. History Computing, Wikipedia Link

10. Computing Platform, Wikipedia Link

11. Cloud Computing, Wikipedia Link

12. Quantum Computing, Wikipedia Link

13. Avatar or Reincarnation, Wikipedia Link

14. Yoga, Wikipedia Link

15. Australia or Down Under, Wikipedia Link

16. Barnett, L. D. (1907). The Brahma Knowledge. An Outline of the Philosophy of the Vedanta as Set Forth by the Upanishads and by Sankara. Wisdom of the East series. E.P. Dutton Publishing, Boston, Massachusetts.

17. Bhattacharyya, A. (1943). On a Measure of Divergence Between Two Statistical Populations Defined by their Probability Distributions, Bull. Calcutta Math. Soc., 35, pp. 99-110.

18. Bhattacharyya, A. (1946). On a measure of divergence between two multinomial populations. Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of Statistics, 401-406.

19. Burges, C. J. (2009). Dimension reduction: A guided tour. Machine Learning, 2(4), 275-365.

20. Burkardt, J. (2014). The Truncated Normal Distribution. Department of Scientific Computing Website, Florida State University.

21. Carroll, L. (1865). (2012 Reprint) Alice's adventures in wonderland. Random House, Penguin Random House, Manhattan, New York.

22. Carroll, L. (1871). (2009 Reprint) Through the looking glass: And what Alice found there. Random House, Penguin Random House, Manhattan, New York.

23. Ceruzzi, P. E. (2003). A history of modern computing. MIT press.

24. Chen, K. M., Chen, M. H., Chao, H. C., Hung, H. M., Lin, H. S., & Li, C. H. (2009). Sleep quality, depression state, and health status of older adults after silver yoga exercises: cluster randomized trial. International journal of nursing studies, 46(2), 154-163.

25. Chiani, M., Dardari, D., & Simon, M. K. (2003). New exponential bounds and approximations for the computation of error probability in fading channels. Wireless Communications, IEEE Transactions on, 2(4), 840-845.

26. Clark, P. K. (1973). A subordinated stochastic process model with finite variance for speculative prices. Econometrica: journal of the Econometric Society, 135-155.

27. Cody, W. J. (1969). Rational Chebyshev approximations for the error function. Mathematics of Computation, 23(107), 631-637.

28. Cohen, L., Warneke, C., Fouladi, R. T., Rodriguez, M., & Chaoul-Reich, A. (2004). Psychological adjustment and sleep quality in a randomized trial of the effects of a Tibetan yoga intervention in patients with lymphoma. Cancer, 100(10), 2253-2260.

29. Coogan, P. (2009). The Definition of the Superhero. A comics studies reader, 77.

30. Dasgupta, S., & Gupta, A. (1999). An elementary proof of the Johnson-Lindenstrauss lemma. International Computer Science Institute, Technical Report, 99-006.

31. Derpanis, K. G. (2008). The Bhattacharyya Measure. Mendeley Computer, 1(4), 1990-1992.

32. Doniger, W. (1976). The origins of evil in Hindu mythology (No. 6). Univ of California Press.

33. Eco, U., & Chilton, N. (1972). The myth of Superman.

34. Fingeroth, D. (2004). Superman on the Couch: What Superheroes Really Tell Us about Ourselves and Our Society. A&C Black.

35. Frankl, P., & Maehara, H. (1988). The Johnson-Lindenstrauss lemma and the sphericity of some graphs. Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B, 44(3), 355-362.

36. Frankl, P., & Maehara, H. (1990). Some geometric applications of the beta distribution. Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics, 42(3), 463-474.

37. Flood, G. D. (1996). An introduction to Hinduism. Cambridge University Press.

38. Fodor, I. K. (2002). A survey of dimension reduction techniques. Technical Report UCRL-ID-148494, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

39. Ghatage, S. (2010). Brahma's Dream. Anchor Canada, Penguin Random House, Manhattan, New York.

40. Haslem, W., Ndalianis, A., & Mackie, C. J. (Eds.). (2007). Super/Heroes: From Hercules to Superman. New Academia Publishing, LLC.

41. Horrace, W. C. (2005). Some results on the multivariate truncated normal distribution. Journal of Multivariate Analysis, 94(1), 209-221.

42. Ifrah, G., Harding, E. F., Bellos, D., & Wood, S. (2000). The universal history of computing: From the abacus to quantum computing. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

43. Johnson, W. B., & Lindenstrauss, J. (1984). Extensions of Lipschitz mappings into a Hilbert space. Contemporary mathematics, 26(189-206), 1.

44. Kashyap, R. (2014a). Dynamic Multi-Factor Bid–Offer Adjustment Model. The Journal of Trading, 9(3), 42-55.

45. Kashyap, R. (2014b). The Circle of Investment. International Journal of Economics and Finance, 6(5), 244-263.

46. Kashyap, R. (2015a). Financial Services, Economic Growth and Well-Being: A Four Pronged Study. Indian Journal of Finance, 9(1), 9-22.

47. Kashyap, R. (2015b). A Tale of Two Consequences. The Journal of Trading, 10(4), 51-95.

48. Kashyap, R. (2016a). Hong Kong - Shanghai Connect / Hong Kong - Beijing Disconnect (?), Scaling the Great Wall of Chinese Securities Trading Costs. The Journal of Trading, 11(3), 81-134.

49. Kashyap, R. (2016b). Combining Dimension Reduction, Distance Measures and Covariance. Working Paper.

50. Kashyap, R. (2016c). Solving the Equity Risk Premium Puzzle and Inching Towards a Theory of Everything. Working Paper.

51. Kashyap, R. (2016d). Fighting Uncertainty with Uncertainty. Working Paper.

52. Kashyap, R. (2016e). Notes on Uncertainty, Unintended Consequences and Everything Else. Working Paper.

53. Kashyap, R. (2016f). The American Dream, An Unsustainable Nightmare. Working Paper.

54. Kattumannil, S. K. (2009). On Stein's identity and its applications. Statistics & Probability Letters, 79(12), 1444-1449.

55. Keynes, J. M. (1937). The General Theory of Employment. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 51(2), 209-223.

56. Keynes, J. M. (1971). The Collected Writings of John Maynard Keynes: In 2 Volumes. A Treatise on Money. The Applied Theory of Money. Macmillan for the Royal Economic Society.

57. Keynes, J. M. (1973). A treatise on probability, the collected writings of John Maynard Keynes, vol. VIII.

58. Khalsa, S. B. S. (2004). Treatment of chronic insomnia with yoga: A preliminary study with sleep–wake diaries. Applied psychophysiology and biofeedback, 29(4), 269-278.

59. Kiani, M., Panaretos, J., Psarakis, S., & Saleem, M. (2008). Approximations to the normal distribution function and an extended table for the mean range of the normal variables.

60. Kimeldorf, G., & Sampson, A. (1973). A class of covariance inequalities. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 68(341), 228-230.

61. Lawson, T. (1985). Uncertainty and economic analysis. The Economic Journal, 95(380), 909-927.

62. Lee, K. Y., & Bretschneider, T. R. (2012). Separability Measures of Target Classes for Polarimetric Synthetic Aperture Radar Imagery. Asian Journal of Geoinformatics, 12(2).

63. Lehrer, J. (2010). The Neuroscience of Inception. Wired 26 Jul. 2010. Web. 13 Aug. 2013.

64. Manjunath, N. K., & Telles, S. (2005). Influence of Yoga & Ayurveda on self-rated sleep in a geriatric population. Indian Journal of Medical Research, 121(5), 683.

65. Mazur, J. E. (2015). Learning and behavior. Psychology Press.

66. McManus, H., & Hastings, D. (2005, July). 3.4. 1 A Framework for Understanding Uncertainty and its Mitigation and Exploitation in Complex Systems. In INCOSE International Symposium (Vol. 15, No. 1, pp. 484-503).

67. Mill, J. (1829). Analysis of the Phenomena of the Human Mind (Vol. 1, 2). Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer.

68. Miranda, M. J., & Fackler, P. L. (2002). Applied Computational Economics and Finance.

69. Moyal, A. (Ed.). (2008). Koala: a historical biography. CSIRO PUBLISHING.

70. Nagy, K. A., & Martin, R. W. (1985). Field Metabolic Rate, Water Flux, Food Consumption and Time Budget of Koalas, Phascolarctos Cinereus (Marsupialia: Phascolarctidae) in Victoria. Australian Journal of Zoology, 33(5), 655-665.

71. Nolan, C. (2010). Inception [film]. Warner Bros.: Los Angeles, CA, USA.

72. Parrinder, E. G. (1997). Avatar and incarnation: the divine in human form in the world's religions. Oneworld Publications Limited.

73. Ramamurthi, B. (1995). The fourth state of consciousness: The Thuriya Avastha. Psychiatry and clinical neurosciences, 49(2), 107-110.

74. Rao, T. G. (1993). Elements of Hindu iconography. Motilal Banarsidass Publisher.

75. Reynolds, R. (1992). Super heroes: A modern mythology. Univ. Press of Mississippi.

76. Rubinstein, M. E. (1973). A comparative statics analysis of risk premiums. The Journal of Business, 46(4), 605-615.

77. Rubinstein, M. (1976). The valuation of uncertain income streams and the pricing of options. The Bell Journal of Economics, 407-425.

78. Shlens, J. (2014). A tutorial on principal component analysis. arXiv preprint arXiv:1404.1100.

79. Simon, H. A. (1962). The Architecture of Complexity. Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, 106(6), 467-482.

80. Smith, M. (1979). Behaviour of the Koala, Phascolarctos Cinereus Goldfuss, in Captivity. 1. Non-Social Behaviour. Wildlife Research, 6(2), 117-129.

81. Soranzo, A., & Epure, E. (2014). Very simply explicitly invertible approximations of normal cumulative and normal quantile function. Applied Mathematical Sciences, 8(87), 4323-4341.

82. Sorzano, C. O. S., Vargas, J., & Montano, A. P. (2014). A survey of dimensionality reduction techniques. arXiv preprint arXiv:1403.2877.

83. Stein, C. M. (1973). Estimation of the mean of a multivariate normal distribution. Proceedings of the Prague Symposium of Asymptotic Statistics.

84. Stein, C. M. (1981). Estimation of the mean of a multivariate normal distribution. The annals of Statistics, 1135-1151.

85. Swami, B. (2011). Bhagavad Gita as it is. The Bhaktivedanta book trust, Mumbai, India.

86. Tauchen, G. E., & Pitts, M. (1983). The Price Variability-Volume Relationship on Speculative Markets. Econometrica, 51(2), 485-505.

87. Teerapabolarn, K. (2013). Stein's identity for discrete distributions. International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics, 83(4), 565.

88. Vera, F. M., Manzaneque, J. M., Maldonado, E. F., Carranque, G. A., Rodriguez, F. M., Blanca, M. J., & Morell, M. (2009). Subjective sleep quality and hormonal modulation in long-term yoga practitioners. Biological psychology, 81(3), 164-168.

89. Williams, M. R. (1997). A history of computing technology. IEEE Computer Society Press.

90. Yang, M. (2008). Normal log-normal mixture, leptokurtosis and skewness. Applied Economics Letters, 15(9), 737-742.

91. Zimmer, H. R. (1972). Myths and symbols in Indian art and civilization (Vol. 6). Princeton University Press.

92. Zogheib, B., & Hlynka, M. (2009). Approximations of the Standard Normal Distribution. University of Windsor, Department of Mathematics and Statistics.

8 Appendix A: Dimension Reduction, Distance Measures and Covariance

All the results below are from (Kashyap 2016b). Other useful references are pointed in the relevant sections below.

8.1 Normal Log-Normal Mixture

Transforming log-normal multi-variate variables into a lower dimension by multiplication with an independent normal distribution (See Lemma 1) results in the sum of variables with a normal log-normal mixture, (Clark 1973; Tauchen and Pitts 1983; Yang 2008), evaluation of which requires numerical techniques (Miranda and Fackler 2002).

A random variable, U, would be termed a normal log-normal mixture if it is of the form,

$$U = Xe^{Y}$$

where, X and Y are random variables with correlation coefficient, ρ satisfying the below,

$$\begin{bmatrix} X \\ Y \end{bmatrix} \sim N\left(\begin{bmatrix} \mu_X \\ \mu_Y \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_X^2 & \rho\sigma_X\sigma_Y \\ \rho\sigma_X\sigma_Y & \sigma_Y^2 \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

We note that for $\sigma_Y = 0$ when Y degenerates to a constant, this is just the distribution of X and ρ is unidentified.

To transform a column vector with d observations of a random variable into a lower dimension of order, $k < d$, we can multiply the column vector with a matrix, $A \sim N(0; \frac{1}{k})$ of dimension $k \times d$.

Lemma 2. *A dimension transformation of d observations of a log-normal variable into a lower dimension, k, using Lemma 1, yields a probability density function which is the sum of random variables with a normal log-normal mixture, given by the convolution,*

$$f_S(s) = f_{U_1}(u_1) * f_{U_2}(u_2) * ... * f_{U_k}(u_k)$$

$$\textit{Here, } f_{U_i}(u_i) = \frac{\sqrt{k}}{2\pi\sigma_{Y_i}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-y - \frac{ku_i^2}{2e^{2y}} - \frac{\left[y-\mu_{Y_i}\right]^2}{2\sigma_{Y_i}^2}} dy$$

$$U_i = X_i e^{Y_i}$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} X_i \\ Y_i \end{bmatrix} \sim N\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \mu_{Y_i} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{k} & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_{Y_i}^2 \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

The convolution of two probability densities arises when we have the sum of two independent random variables, $Z = X + Y$. *The density of* Z, $h_Z(z)$ *is given by,*

$$h_Z(z) = (f_X * f_Y)(z) = f_X(x) * f_Y(y) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_X(z-y) * f_Y(y)\, dy = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_X(x) * f_Y(z-x)\, dx$$

When the number of independent random variables being added is more than two, or the reduced dimension after the Lemma 1 transformation is more than two, $k > 2$, *then we can take the convolution of the density resulting after the convolution of the first two random variables, with the density of the third variable and so on in a pair wise manner, till we have the final density.*

8.2 Normal Normal Product

For completeness, we illustrate how dimension reduction would work on a data-set containing random variables that have normal distributions. This can serve as a useful benchmark given the wide usage of the normal distribution and can be an independently useful result, though most variables observed in real life are normally not so normal.

Lemma 3. *A dimension transformation of* d *observations of a normal variable into a lower dimension,* k, *using Lemma 1, yields a probability density function which is the sum of random variables with a normal normal product distribution, given by the convolution,*

$$f_S(s) = f_{U_1}(u_1) * f_{U_2}(u_2) * ... * f_{U_k}(u_k)$$

$$\textit{Here, } f_{U_i}(u_i) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{|x|}\right) \frac{1}{\sigma_{Y_i}\sqrt{2\pi}}\, e^{-\frac{\left(x-\mu_{Y_i}\right)^2}{2\sigma_{Y_i}^2}} \sqrt{\frac{k}{2\pi}}\, e^{-\frac{k\left(\frac{u_i}{x}\right)^2}{2}} dx$$

$$U_i = X_i Y_i$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} X_i \\ Y_i \end{bmatrix} \sim N\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \mu_{Y_i} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{k} & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_{Y_i}^2 \end{bmatrix}\right)$$

8.3 Truncated Normal Distribution

A truncated normal distribution is the probability distribution of a normally distributed random variable whose value is either bounded below, above or both (Horrace 2005; Burkardt 2014). (Kiani, Panaretos, Psarakis and Saleem 2008; Zogheib and Hlynka 2009; Soranzo and Epure 2014) list some of the numerous techniques to calculate the normal cumulative distribution. Approximations to the error function are also

feasible options (Cody 1969; Chiani, Dardari and Simon 2003). Despite the truncation, this could be a potent extension when it is known a-priori that the values a variable can take are almost surely bounded.

Suppose $X \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)$ has a normal distribution and lies within the interval $X \in (a, b),\ -\infty \leq a < b \leq \infty$. Then X conditional on $a < X < b$ has a truncated normal distribution. Its probability density function, f_X, for $a \leq x \leq b$, is given by

$$f_X\left(x \mid \mu, \sigma^2, a, b\right) = \begin{cases} \frac{\frac{1}{\sigma}\phi\left(\frac{x-\mu}{\sigma}\right)}{\Phi\left(\frac{b-\mu}{\sigma}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{a-\mu}{\sigma}\right)} & ; a \leq x \leq b \\ 0 & ; \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Here, $\phi(\xi)=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\xi^2\right)$ is the probability density function of the standard normal distribution and $\Phi(\cdot)$ is its cumulative distribution function. There is an understanding that if $b=\infty$, then $\Phi(\frac{b-\mu}{\sigma})=1$, and similarly, if $a=-\infty$, then $\Phi(\frac{a-\mu}{\sigma})=0$.

Lemma 4. *The Bhattacharyya distance, when we have truncated normal distributions p, q that do not overlap, is zero and when they overlap, it is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} D_{BC-TN}(p,q) \quad = \quad & \frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{(\mu_p-\mu_q)^2}{\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2}\right)+\frac{1}{4}\ln\left(\frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{\sigma_p^2}{\sigma_q^2}+\frac{\sigma_q^2}{\sigma_p^2}+2\right)\right) \\ & +\frac{1}{2}\ln\left[\Phi\left(\frac{b-\mu_p}{\sigma_p}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{a-\mu_p}{\sigma_p}\right)\right]+\frac{1}{2}\ln\left[\Phi\left(\frac{d-\mu_q}{\sigma_q}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{c-\mu_q}{\sigma_q}\right)\right] \\ & -\ln\left\{\Phi\left[\frac{u-\nu}{\varsigma}\right]-\Phi\left[\frac{l-\nu}{\varsigma}\right]\right\} \end{aligned}$$

Here,

$$p \sim N\left(\mu_p, \sigma_p^2, a, b\right)\ ;\ q \sim N\left(\mu_q, \sigma_q^2, c, d\right)$$

$$l = \min\left(a, c\right)\ ;\ u = \min\left(b, d\right)$$

$$\nu = \frac{\left(\mu_p\sigma_q^2+\mu_q\sigma_p^2\right)}{\left(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2\right)}\ ;\ \varsigma = \sqrt{\frac{2\sigma_p^2\sigma_q^2}{\left(\sigma_p^2+\sigma_q^2\right)}}$$

8.4 Truncated Multivariate Normal Distribution

Similarly, a truncated multivariate normal distribution $\boldsymbol{X}$ has the density function,

$$f_{\mathbf{X}}\left(x_1, \ldots, x_k \mid \boldsymbol{\mu_p},\, \boldsymbol{\Sigma_p},\, \boldsymbol{a},\, \boldsymbol{b}\right) = \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_p}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\right)\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_p}\right))}{\int_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{\boldsymbol{b}}\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_p}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}\right)\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu_p}\right))\,d\boldsymbol{x};\ \boldsymbol{x} \in \boldsymbol{R}_{\boldsymbol{a}\leq\boldsymbol{x}\leq\boldsymbol{b}}^{k}}$$

Here, $\boldsymbol{\mu_p}$ is the mean vector and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}$ is the symmetric positive definite covariance matrix of the $\boldsymbol{p}$ distribution and the integral is a k dimensional integral with lower and upper bounds given by the vectors $(\boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b})$ and $\boldsymbol{x} \in \boldsymbol{R}^{\boldsymbol{k}}_{\boldsymbol{a} \leq \boldsymbol{x} \leq \boldsymbol{b}}$.

Lemma 5. *The Bhattacharyya coefficient when we have truncated multivariate normal distributions $\boldsymbol{p}, \boldsymbol{q}$ and all the k dimensions have some overlap, is given by*

$$
\begin{aligned}
D_{BC-TMN}\left(\boldsymbol{p}, \boldsymbol{q}\right) \quad = \quad & \frac{1}{8}(\boldsymbol{\mu_p} - \boldsymbol{\mu_q})^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\mu_p} - \boldsymbol{\mu_q}) + \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(\frac{\det \boldsymbol{\Sigma}}{\sqrt{\det \boldsymbol{\Sigma_p} \det \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}}} \right) \\
& + \frac{1}{2} \ln \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^k \left(|\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}|\right)}} \int_{\boldsymbol{a}}^{\boldsymbol{b}} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu_p} \right)^{\mathrm{T}} \right) \boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1} \left(\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu_p} \right) \Big) \, d\boldsymbol{x}; \; \boldsymbol{x} \in \boldsymbol{R}^{k}_{\boldsymbol{a} \leq \boldsymbol{x} \leq \boldsymbol{b}} \right] \\
& + \frac{1}{2} \ln \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^k \left(|\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}|\right)}} \int_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{\boldsymbol{d}} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu_q} \right)^{\mathrm{T}} \right) \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1} \left(\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu_q} \right) \Big) \, d\boldsymbol{x}; \; \boldsymbol{x} \in \boldsymbol{R}^{k}_{\boldsymbol{c} \leq \boldsymbol{x} \leq \boldsymbol{d}} \right] \\
& - \ln \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^k \det \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q} \right)}} \right. \\
& \left. \int_{\boldsymbol{l}}^{\boldsymbol{u}} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \left\{ \left(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{m} \right)^{\mathrm{T}} \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1} \left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \right] \boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1} \right) \left(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{m} \right) \right\} \right) d\boldsymbol{x}; \; \boldsymbol{x} \in \boldsymbol{R}^{k}_{\boldsymbol{\min(a,c)} \leq \boldsymbol{x} \leq \boldsymbol{\min(b,d)}} \right]
\end{aligned}
$$

Here,

$$\boldsymbol{p} \sim N\left(\boldsymbol{\mu_p}, \, \boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}, \, \boldsymbol{a}, \, \boldsymbol{b}\right)$$

$$\boldsymbol{q} \sim N\left(\boldsymbol{\mu_q}, \, \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}, \, \boldsymbol{c}, \, \boldsymbol{d}\right)$$

$$\boldsymbol{u} = \boldsymbol{\min}\left(\boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{d}\right) \; ; \; \boldsymbol{l} = \boldsymbol{\min}\left(\boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{c}\right)$$

$$\mathbf{m} = \left[\left(\boldsymbol{\mu_p}^{\mathrm{T}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\mu_q}^{\mathrm{T}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1} \right) \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p}^{-1} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}^{-1} \right)^{-1} \right]^{\mathrm{T}}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \frac{\boldsymbol{\Sigma_p} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma_q}}{2}$$

8.5 Covariance and Distance

The following is a general extension to Stein's lemma (Stein 1973, 1981; Rubinstein 1973, 1976) that does not require normality, involving the covariance between a random variable and a function of another random variable. Kattumannil (2009) extends the Stein lemma by relaxing the requirement of normality. (Teerapabolarn 2013) is a further extension of this normality relaxation to discrete distributions. Another useful reference, (Kimeldorf and Sampson 1973), provides a class of inequalities between the covariance of two random variables and the variance of a function of the two random variables.

Lemma 6. *The following equations govern the relationship between the Bhattacharyya distance, $\rho(f_X, f_Y)$, and the covariance between any two distributions with joint density function, $f_{XY}(t,u)$, means, μ_X and μ_Y and density functions $f_X(t)$ and $f_Y(t)$,*

$$Cov[c(X), Y] = Cov(X,Y) - E\left[\sqrt{\frac{f_Y(t)}{f_X(t)}}Y\right] + \mu_Y \rho(f_X, f_Y)$$

$$Cov(X,Y) + \mu_Y \rho(f_X, f_Y) = E[c'(X)\ g(X,Y)] + E\left[\sqrt{\frac{f_Y(t)}{f_X(t)}}Y\right]$$

Here,

$$c(t) = t - \sqrt{\frac{f_Y(t)}{f_X(t)}}$$

and $g(t,u)$ is a non-vanishing function such that,

$$\frac{f'_{XY}(t,u)}{f_{XY}(t,u)} = -\frac{g'(t,u)}{g(t,u)} + \frac{[\mu_Y - u]}{g(t,u)} \quad , \quad t,u \in (a,b)$$